

Siva Venkatraman *et. al.*
Appl. No. 10/056,393

Remarks

Status of the Claims

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the instant application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Upon entry of the amendment, claims 1-11, 13-18 and 23-28 will be pending in the application. Of these, claims 1 and 11 are independent. Claims 12 and 19-22 are sought to be canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 29 and 30 are withdrawn from consideration as a result of a restriction requirement. In addition, the specification has been amended. Applicants believe that these changes introduce no new matter. Entry and consideration of this amendment are respectfully requested.

Objections to the Specification

The specification is objected to because of several informalities listed by the Examiner. The specification has been amended as suggested by the Examiner to address these informalities. Approval and entry of these proposed amendments are respectfully requested.

Objections to the Claims

Claims 12 and 20 are objected to because the Examiner states that the claims are improperly listed as “(Currently Amended)”. Claims 12 and 20 were amended to remove the comma after the “wherein” statement in each claim. These amendments were made to keep the formatting of all of the claims consistent. Applicants acknowledge that the amendments in claims 12 and 20 were not easily identifiable and apologize to the Examiner for any inconvenience.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, because there is insufficient antecedent basis for the “the corresponding size of addressable space of the memory block” limitation in the claim. Claim 10 has been amended as suggested by the

Siva Venkatraman *et. al.*
Appl. No. 10/056,393

Examiner to overcome the objection to the claim. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the objection to the claim be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 3-5 and 9-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application No. US 2001/0042223 A1 (hereinafter referred to as "Hoskins"). Claims 2 and 14-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Hoskins as applied to claims 11-13 and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,848,021 (hereinafter referred to as "Sugibayashi"). Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Hoskins as applied to claim 1 and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,141,768 (hereinafter referred to as "Lin"). Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Hoskins as applied to claims 1 and 3 and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,922,451 (hereinafter referred to as "Lo") and U.S. Patent No. 3,735,368 (hereinafter referred to as "Beausoliel"). Claims 12 and 19-22 are sought to be canceled and thus rendering the rejection to these claims moot. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections to claims 1-11, 13-18 and 23-28 since Hoskins, Sugibayashi, Lin, Lo and Beausoliel, either taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each element of amended independent claims 1 and 11 (and their dependent claims 2-10, 13-18 and 23-28) for at least the following reason.

Independent claims 1 and 11 have been amended to include a similar feature of wherein one or more controllers operate in parallel to test at least some of the one or more memory blocks at the same time. Hoskins, Sugibayashi, Lin, Lo and Beausoliel,

Siva Venkatraman *et. al.*
Appl. No. 10/056,393

either taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest one or more controllers operating in parallel to test at least some of the one or more memory blocks at the same time. Therefore, for at least this reason, independent claims 1 and 11 (and their dependent claims 2-10, 13-18 and 23-28) are patentable over Hoskins, Sugibayashi, Lin, Lo and Beausoliel, either taken alone or in combination. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Siva Venkatraman *et. al.*
Appl. No. 10/056,393

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed accommodated or rendered moot. Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action. Thus, Applicants believe that the present application is in condition for allowance, and as such, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections, and allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Intel Corporation

Dated: January 13, 2005

/Molly A. McCall/
Molly A. McCall
Patent Attorney
Intel Americas, Inc.
Registration No. 46,126
(703) 633-3311

P14044 reply to office action.v2

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted
to the United States Patent and Trademark Office at:

1 - 103 - 872 - 9306

Facsimile Number


Signature

Date

1-13-05